

App. No. 10/816,485  
Office Action Dated August 23, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2006

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claim 1 has been editorially revised as agreed to by the Examiner in an interview with the Examiner on October 31, 2006. Claim has been canceled; and the limitations of claim 25 have been added to claim 1. Claims 1-3 remain pending in the application. The revision of claim 1 is supported by Figures 1A and 1B, including the descriptions thereof in the specification. Applicants appreciate the courtesy shown by the Examiner in discussing this application with their representative on October 31, 2006. The above revisions and the following remarks reflect the substance of those discussions.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102**

Claims 1-3 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Argyrakis (US 5,373,109). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 is directed to a wiring board, comprising in part, a plurality of conductive layers other than ground layers, each conductive layer including no more than one wiring for transmitting signals. This is clearly different from the invention disclosed by Argyrakis that does not disclose or suggest a wiring board including a plurality of conductive layers other than ground layers, in which each conductive layer includes no more than one wiring as required by claim 1. Rather, Argyrakis teaches a plurality of layers of multiple electrically conductive signal carrying conductors (12, 14, 16). See Figure 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Argyrakis. Claims 2 and 3 are also patentable over Argyrakis since they depend from claim 1 that is allowable.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Johnston (US 3,882,265). The limitations of claim 25, which was not rejected over Johnston, have been added to claim 1, rendering this rejection moot. Applicants do not concede the correctness of the rejection. Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons

App. No. 10/816,485

Office Action Dated August 23, 2006

discussed above regarding the rejection of claims 1-3 in view of Argyrakis. Johnston does not remedy the deficiencies of Argyrakis.

Favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Dated: November 9, 2006



DPM:dnh

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Douglas P. Mueller". The signature is written over a horizontal line.

Douglas P. Mueller

Reg. No.: 30,300

Hamre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.

225 South Sixth Street

Suite 2650

Minneapolis, MN 55402

612.455.3800